

MAIL.

List." Published every Evening

PRICE, \$24 PER ANNUM

Shipping:

Agents.
Hongkong, September 27, 1877.

charged on remand by Sergeant Mackie with



me. I walked there. I afterwards saw a number of bodies at the dead-house at the Hospital, among them that of my brother. Dr. Ayres was next called, and said—“I am the Colonial Surgeon. I remember the morning of the accident on board the Yesso. (The Doctor's evidence was in substance the same as that given by him at the Coroner's Inquest.)

The evidence of Doctors Adams and Rogers was next taken, but as it was in substance the same as that given at the Coroner's Enquiry, and already published, we refrain from giving it.

Mr May then said that he thought they should go on till 1 o'clock, and then adjourn till Thursday, but he left it to the convenience of counsel.

Mr Sharp said he should of course study the convenience of the Court, but he should like if they could begin later in the day. Messrs Francis and Breton both concurred in this, and suggested 11 o'clock, when they need not have any adjournment but go on till 4 o'clock.

To this Mr May agreed, and asked Mr Sharp if he had any more witnesses to call now.

Mr Sharp proposed to call one of the Doctors of the Tung Wah Hospital, when Mr Francis objected to his evidence being taken; he (Mr Francis) thought such evidence was quite irrelevant and was only wasting time. The witness in question could know nothing of Tang Asam. It was necessary to know what they were here to investigate. At present he was quite in ignorance. The evidence of Dr Rogers as to the death of Mr Haggat was quite irrelevant to the charge. If they were to investigate into the death of Mr Haggat, he (Mr Francis) might think it desirable to set up a defence as to the treatment he received, and would have some evidence to support it.

He thought that it was only the specific charge which appeared on the charge-sheet they could investigate.

Mr May said he thought he could say from long experience that the charge-sheet only showed the character of the charge or what the opinion of the officer who took the charge had as to the offence. In reply to Mr Francis's warning said if, whilst investigating a charge of burglary, it was found the offence was not burglary but something else, he would go on with the case.

Mr Francis said it would often be a great injustice to the accused, the first charge should be disposed of and another made.

Mr May said it was the practice here.

Mr Francis said that it might be the practice here, but it was nevertheless often a great injustice to the accused.

Mr Breton asked His Worship if, in the course of an enquiry a charge of murder cropped up which was shown occurred two years previously, he would investigate it then and there.

Mr May said he certainly would. He thought the evidence of the doctor should be taken if Mr Sharp wished it.

Mr Francis still thought it a waste of time.

Lum Tai Shie, a doctor at the Tung Wah Hospital, was then examined and proved the admission of ten injured men into the Hospital, eight of whom have since died. In cross-examination by Mr Francis he said—

I studied medicine at Tientsin-sha. I was 10 years a student. I rubbed the patients with salad oil and powder of green peas. (Mr Breton observed that he ought to have had some roast lamb along with it.) The men who came from the Civil Hospital died as soon as they were admitted. I could not have cured them if they had come to the Tung Wah Hospital at first. I reside at the Hospital, and get 25 pence per month and find myself. I gave internal and external medicine. I gave the patient ginseng and a decoction of roots.

Mama Dries, the Serang on board the Yesso, was next called, and proved identifying the body of Mahomed Eop, the Malay who was killed; and the enquiry was then adjourned till 11 o'clock on Thursday morning, the 7th instant; the prisoners being admitted to bail as before.

(Before James Russell, Esq.)

LACKEY.

Tam Atak, a coolie, was sentenced to 6 weeks' imprisonment with hard labour for stealing a file.

DRUNKS AND CHAIR-HIRE AGAIN.

William Allen, a seaman belonging to H. M. S. Curlew, was charged with being drunk and refusing to pay chair-hire. He said he had paid 10 cents and the man had carried him only 100 yards. The chair-bearer declared he had carried the defendant for over an hour. Inspector Grey said the defendant was very drunk and refused to pay the chair. He looked him up for his (defendant's) own safety. Defendant said he had no money, but witness found \$1.88 on him. Fined 20 cents and to pay 25 cents arrears.

William Cormick, a seaman belonging to the British 3-m. schooner *Vincennes*, was fined \$1 or 2 days' imprisonment for being drunk and assaulting, or, as the defendant styled it, "shaping" for, the constable who arrested him.

William Phillips, a seaman belonging to the British ship *Isles of the South*, was charged with being drunk and running about the Canton wharf threatening to strike people. He at length fell in the water and was picked up by the Police boat. Fined \$1 or 4 days' imprisonment.

Andrew Larsen, a seaman unemployed, was charged with being drunk and assaulting one Joe Asoo, a boy at the Sailor's Home, and was fined \$1 or 2 days' imprisonment.

William Ferguson, a seaman unemployed, was charged with a similar offence, and fined \$1 or 7 days' imprisonment with hard labour.

BREACH OF THE STAMP ACT.

The master of the *Shun Sui Hong*, No. 68 Bonham Strand West, was summoned at the instance of the Collector of Stamp Revenue for a breach of the Stamp Act, in that he gave a receipt for a sum of money exceeding \$10 without affixing a Stamp, as required by Section XXIII of Ordinance 12 of 1866. The case came on first on the 1st December, when Mr Lister, the Collector, said that it had come to his knowledge that there were several Chinese merchants who had neglected to use receipts stamped as required by the Ordinance. He (witness) had sent for them and cautioned them; but the defendant did not think fit to call upon him, so he took on to-day the summons. When the case came on to-day the defendant was discharged on a caution, as Mr Russell was of opinion that the combined effect of Ordinance 10 of 1864 and the Stamp Ordinance acted as a bar to the prosecution; proceedings being taken six months after the offence was committed.

SUPREME COURT.

IN SUMMARY JURISDICTION.

(Before His Honour Mr Justice Snowdon.)

Dec. 4, 1877.

Meyer v. Richards and Company, \$900.—This case was again postponed till next Tuesday. Mr Johnson appeared for the plaintiff, and Mr Breton for the defendant.

Walter v. Fustan and Co., \$1,600.—Mr Breton, who appeared for the defendant, applied for the case to be postponed for the present, as the matter was practically settled. Mr Johnson, on behalf of Mr Sharp, who appeared for the plaintiff, consented to the further adjournment.

Lo Yu v. S. R. Nesto, \$593.62.—This was a claim for balance of contract money for the building of a house. Mr Denney, for the plaintiff, said that a note of demand had been sent to the defendant about a month ago, but the defendant took no notice of it until this morning, when the plaintiff received a letter from the defendant, in which he stated that he had received several prohibitory orders in regard to the payment of the money over to the plaintiff, and that he was not liable to pay.

The defendant said he had received prohibitory orders to the amount of more than \$700, that he claimed a penalty from the plaintiff for delay in delivering the house, and that there were works which the plaintiff had not supplied or improperly performed, and that according to the agreement the differences should have been referred to Mr Bowdler.

His Lordship adjourned the case till next week, for Mr Denney to see the documents connected with the case.

C. L. Thersin v. Lamb, \$44.70.—The plaintiff claimed from the defendant for wines supplied, viz. brandy and champagne. When the case was first called, the plaintiff was not in Court, but when he did appear, His Lordship said he had hoped he would not have been here.

The plaintiff then proved his claim, but the defendant said the wines were not supplied to him; they were sent to the house for the plaintiff's own use during the time he was living in her house.

After hearing a few words of the case only, His Lordship said he was astonished to see the plaintiff coming into Court again in a case like this. He was astonished at his want of good sense and consideration for the decency of this Court. This was a most disgraceful case, and he would not hear more of it, he had had enough of it. The plaintiff of it, he was not satisfied, as his Lordship was not going to try a case of this kind in a Court of Justice.

THE "HELICON" CASE.

The following is the continuation of the judgment delivered by the Chief Justice in the above case. It will be found of interest, bearing as it does on the status of Consuls in this Colony.

I have stated the material facts, I have also given the arguments of counsel to me to arise.

1.—As to the objection that the Imperial Act of 1852 repealed (or suspended as to the United States at least) the Ordinance of 1850, the arguments on both sides are very ingenious—and the question is whether the jurisdiction of the magistrate is not entirely taken away?

2.—On the face of the commitment and of the proceedings produced on the writ of *certiorari*, is it or is it not bad?

It is stated to be the complaint of Richard Brun R. O. 27.

I see nothing in the Act to authorise a constable to be the complainant against a deserter from a foreign ship. Must not the master or mate or consul be such complainant, and does not this objection vitiate the conviction and commitment?

This case comes before the Court on the return to the *habeas corpus*, the commitment, and on the magistrate's return to the writ of *certiorari*, so that all the proceedings are before the Court to discharge the prisoner if upon the face of the writ it be bad or if upon any of the proceedings returned the conviction and commitment be bad.

A writ of error does not lie for a defect in proceedings before magistrates, but it is expressly laid down in Coroner, the only work of authority recognised in the Crown Office in England, at p. 64, that the writ of *certiorari* lies in the only means by which a review of proceedings in a Magistrate's Court by a Superior Court can be obtained, and it lies as well after judgment as before.

Of course an aggrieved party may also resort to an appeal in cases in which the appeal is given, but the power of the Court is not so complete over the person or generally so conclusive in an appeal as it is under a writ of *habeas corpus*.

Upon all the papers before the Court, looking at the proceedings, I find that Braun, the alleged complainant, not sworn, states that he arrested the defendant at different places and at different times as being deserters, but even he did not allege that Clark was a deserter.

It was then, although no charge on oath or otherwise was before the Court, that the men were deserters, that statements were taken down from each defendant. What they then said was improperly, prematurely asked for, but Clark said nothing to conclude the defence which in due time Mr Denney made.

After that the master was examined, I presume that he produced the ship's articles. It does not appear in the proceedings whether any man of the name of Clark signed them, but it is quite clear that there was no proof that the defendant Clark signed, for the captain admitted that although he had certified that he had seen all the men sign he could not swear positively that he saw any of the men sign. If he did not, was there any legal evidence that Clark was under articles or can he be said to be a deserter if not under legal contract at the date when he left the ship?

Under these circumstances, could the magistrate presume against Clark—not being proved to be under contract—that he was a deserter?

The proceedings upon their face are jointly against seven seamen, each for being a deserter, each arrested at a different time, and so far as the log evidence of desertion produced goes, Clark alone deserted on the 22nd of October. No one else deserted on that day, and the proceedings disclose no evidence of conspiracy or agreement by him or of his having any common design with any other person charged; there was nothing in the act of desertion of a joint character.

Was it not clear that Clark ought to have been charged and proceeded against separately for his own separate offence? Is not this the right of every man when there is a criminal charge against him and in that case, would Clark not be entitled to call the other seamen, the only witnesses he could call in his favour? Is not the proceeding bad, and the conviction bad, where the accused is refused liberty to call his witnesses on the ground that they have been so if improperly joined in one charge with him?

5.—If, as it has been contended, the proceeding was a mere civil proceeding, to compel a specific performance, then have not the Acts and Ordinances as to evidence entitled defendants themselves, each and every one of them, to be examined for themselves and for each other?

6.—When Clark, through Mr Denney, set up the conduct of the captain in improperly refusing to lower a boat to save a seaman who had fallen overboard, was it not then the function of the magistrate to hear matters that occurred on the high seas; and to have considered, and to have decided on the evidence when taken whether such action by the captain on the high seas constituted a sufficient reason for Clark's leaving the ship in Hongkong?

If the proceedings were of a non-criminal character, then could not Clark himself as well as his co-defendants claim as of right to give such testimony?

Would not these considerations render the conviction bad, and the commitment founded on it bad?

7.—From a correspondence between the magistrate and the United States Consul annexed to the return to the writ of *certiorari*, I find that the magistrate informed the Consul that he purposed (i.e. had decided) to enter into an inquiry on allegations by Clark as to the *Zelicon*, and courteously invited the Consul's attendance, but the Consul required the attendance of all the men charged before the magistrate at the Consulate, and he undertook the inquiry into that excuse of the men for absenting themselves from the ship out of the hands of the magistrate, and made a quasi return in a note to the magistrate dated November 2nd, that the charges that no attempt was made to rescue the man who had fallen overboard was entirely unfounded. The Consul concludes with a request that the men (including Clark) may be detained and delivered to the master under Ordinance 4 of 1850, and thus the inquiry which the magistrate had purposed was stopped.

This interference of the Consul with the regular procedure in a criminal case inaugurated by himself by his offer of a reward in order that Clark might be presented to the magistrate under Ordinance 4 of 1850, appears to me to be an act by the Consul authorised neither by law nor comity.

This case was before a tribunal authorised to administer oaths. The Consul has no authority to administer oaths in such a matter which can be used in any English Court of law, and any proceeding by him in reference to a criminal charge is entirely invalid in a Court of criminal procedure.

The words I used on hearing the argument as to the status of a Consul in this country were more guarded than those of Chancellor Kent, one of the greatest of American jurists. At 1 Kent's Com., 51, it is said "In England it has been held that a Consul is not a judicial officer, and he is not strictly a judicial officer, and they have there no judicial powers," he says Waldron v. Combs, III. Tan, 162, an English authority in which the certificate of a Consul even in a civil case was held inadmissible to prove the proceeds of a sale at auction. Chief-Justice Mansfield said, "The Vice Consul is no judicial officer."

There is no rule in the English law which makes his certificate evidence. He is so far supposed to be an agent, and he is so for some purposes. So is an auctioneer in this country, nevertheless his certificate is no evidence in this country. It is so in a criminal proceeding involving the liberty of a British subject as Clark.

I understand that what I said during the hearing has given umbrage to some persons whose respect I recommend such persons to read carefully the case I have just cited, and 1 Kent's Com., pp. 51 and 53, and Judge Bouvier's Law Dictionary, the 14th edition of which printed at Philadelphia, 1872, is now before me. Under Article "Consul," par. 6, the learned American judge says:—"A Consul is clothed only with authority for commercial purposes; and in par. 7, he says:—"In civil and criminal cases they are subject to the local laws in the same manner with other foreign residents owing a temporary allegiance to the State." Gentlemen disaffected with these regulations will find abundant food for reflection in the numerous works collected by the learned American judge at the end of his article "Consul."

The certificate of the Consul is therefore invalid for all judicial purposes.

Instead of refusing any recognition of this interference by the Consul I find this entry signed by the magistrate in the proceedings, "Defendant, in Court further expanded till the 5th November, pending the termination of the Consul's inquiry and to be let out from time to time as the Consul may want them."

This entry, forming part of the proceedings, as well as the correspondence, shows that the magistrate had yielded to the Consul's claim to hear and determine and report in reference to the drowning, as evidence concluding the season.

The correspondence is imperfect; it does not contain a letter from the magistrate to which by his second letter of the 30th of October the Consul thanks him.

The magistrate on the 2nd of November received a note from the Consul—I cannot call it a formal report or a certificate—in which he says that the charge made of criminal neglect in the captain as to the drowning man is entirely unfounded.

Now this inquiry was extra-judicial, and was not on oath, and the text-writers (the case quoted is English, the text-writers are American) is good, the informal note, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled by the Consul, and not as affecting the position of the defendant." This acceptance of the statement made by the Consul of the conclusion to which he had come was contrary to law, to which he had come, was contrary to law, even if it amounted to a certificate, was not receivable for any purpose by the magistrate, but I find, when Mr Denney attacked it, that he was not allowed to cross-examine the captain in reference to the drowning of the seaman from the ship, it is recorded by the magistrate himself that "the Court decided that that master was irrelevant, having been inquired into and settled

Mails.



STEAM FOR

Singapore, Penang, Point de Galle, Aden, Suez, Malta, Brindisi, Ancona, Venice, Mediterranean Ports, Southampton, and London.

Also, Bombay, Madras, and Calcutta.

THE PACIFIC MAIL AND ORIENTAL STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY'S Steamship **WYALLOO**, Captain J. O. Baber, will leave this on THURSDAY, the 6th December, at Noon.

For further Particulars, apply to
A. LIND, Superintendent.
Hongkong, November 23, 1877. de6

Occidental & Oriental Steam-Ship Company.

TAKING THROUGH CARGO AND PASSENGERS FOR THE UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA, IN CONNECTION WITH THE CENTRAL

and UNION PACIFIC AND CONNECTING RAILROAD COMPANIES

AND ATLANTIC STEAMERS.

THE S.S. "BELGIO" will be dispatched for San Francisco via Yokohama, on SATURDAY, the 8th December, at 3 p.m., taking Cargo and Passengers for Japan, the United States and Europe.

Connection is made at Yokohama, with Steamers from Shanghai.
Freight will be received on Board until 4 p.m. of the 7th December. PARCEL PACKAGES will be received at the Office until 5 p.m. same day; all Parcel Packages should be marked to address in full; value of same is required.

A Reduction is made on Return Passage Tickets.
For further information, apply to the Agent of the Company, No. 81, Queen's Road Central.
G. B. EMORY, Agent.
Hongkong, November 27, 1877. de6

NOTICE.
COMPAGNIE DES MESSEAGERIES MARITIMES.
PAQUEBOTS POSTE FRANCAIS.

STEAM FOR SAIGON, SINGAPORE, BATAVIA, POINT DE GALLE, ADEN, SUEZ, ISMAILIA, PORT SAID, NAPLES, AND MARSEILLES.
Also, PONDICHERRY, MADRAS, CALCUTTA AND BOMBAY.

ON THURSDAY, the 13th December, 1877, at Noon, the Company's S.S. **PELHO**, Commandant Lacombe, with MAILS, PASSENGERS, SPOILS, and CARGO, will leave this Port for the above places.

Cargo and Spoils will be registered for London as well as for Marseilles, and accepted in transit through Marseilles for the principal places of Europe.
Cargo will be received on board until 4 p.m., Spoils and Parcels until 8 p.m. on the 12th December, 1877. (Parcels are not to be sent on board; they must be left at the Agency's Office.)
Contents and value of Packages are required.
For further particulars, apply at the Company's Office.
H. DU POUY, Agent.
Hongkong, December 3, 1877. de13

U. S. MAIL LINE.

PACIFIC MAIL STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

THROUGH TO NEW YORK, VIA OVERLAND RAILWAYS, AND TOUCHING AT YOKOHAMA, AND SAN FRANCISCO.

THE U. S. Mail Steamer **CITY OF TOKIO** will be dispatched for San Francisco via Yokohama, on WEDNESDAY, the 13th December, at Noon, taking Passengers, and Freight, for Japan, the United States and Europe.

Through Bills of Lading issued for transportation to Yokohama and Japan Ports, to San Francisco, to Atlantic and Indian Oceans of the United States via Overland Railways, to Havana, Trinidad, and Demerara, and to ports in Mexico, Central and South America by the Company's and connecting Steamers.

Through Passage Tickets granted to England, France, and Germany by all transatlantic lines of Steamers.
A REDUCTION OF TWENTY PER CENT on regular rates is granted to OFFICERS of the ARMY and NAVY, and MEMBERS of the CIVIL and CONSULAR SERVICES in COMMISSION.

Freight will be received on board until 4 p.m., 13th December. Parcel Packages will be received at the office until 5 p.m. same day; all Parcel Packages should be marked to address in full; value of same is required.
Circulars Involves to accompany Overland Cargo should be sent to the Company's Office in sealed Envelopes, addressed to the Collector of Customs at San Francisco.
For further information, apply to the Agent of the Company, No. 81, Queen's Road Central.
RUSSELL & Co., Agents.
Hongkong, November 27, 1877. de13

NOTICES TO CONSIGNEES.

BRITISH STEAMER **BERTHA**, LANCLET, Master, FROM LONDON, PENANG, AND SINGAPORE.

CONSIGNEES of Cargo by the above Steamer are hereby informed, that their Goods are being landed and stored at their risk in the Godowns of the Underwriter, from whence delivery may be obtained.
Consignees wishing to take delivery of their Goods from the Boats alongside the Wharf are at liberty to do so.
Goods remaining in store after the 9th Instant will be subject to rent.
No Fire Insurance has been effected.
Optional Cargo will be forwarded unless written notice to the contrary is given before To-day, the 3rd Instant, at 1 p.m.
Bills of Lading will be countersigned by Wm. PUGST & Co., Agents.
Hongkong, December 3, 1877. de9

FROM LONDON AND PORTS OF CALL.

THE Steamship **Gordon Castle**, having arrived, Consignees of Cargo are hereby informed that their Goods are being landed at their risk by the Underwriter into their Godowns, whence and/or from the Wharf or Boats, delivery may be obtained.
Optional Goods will be forwarded to Shanghai, unless notice to the contrary is given before Noon To-morrow, the 3rd Instant.
Cargo remaining undelivered after the 10th Instant will be subject to rent.
No Fire Insurance has been effected.
Bills of Lading will be countersigned by GIBB, LIVINGSTON & Co., Agents.
Hongkong, December 2, 1877. de10

NOTICE TO CONSIGNEES.

P. & O. S. N. Co.'s S.S. **TEHERAN**.

CONSIGNEES of Cargo by the above-named Vessel, from Bombay and Intermediate Ports, in connection with the Steamship **KASHGAR** from Calcutta, are hereby informed that their Goods are being landed, and stored at their risk in the Company's Godowns, at West Point, whence delivery can be obtained from this date.
Goods not delivered by the 10th Instant will be subject to rent.
ADAM LIND, Superintendent.
Hongkong, December 3, 1877. de10

NOTICES OF FIRMS.

NOTICE.
We have this Day placed the MANAGEMENT of our Business in the hands of Mr. WILLIAM ROSS, who has been in the employment of the Firm for the last Six Years.

G. FALCONER & Co., Watchmakers, Jewellers, &c.
Hongkong, November 30, 1877. de7

NOTICE.
MR. CHARLES DAVID BOTTOMLEY was admitted a PARTNER in our Firm on the 1st July, 1877.

DOUGLAS LAPRAIK & Co.
Hongkong, September 22, 1877.

NOTICE.
I HAVE this Day Established myself at this Port as a GENERAL COMMISSION AGENT.

J. V. VERNON SHAW.
Hongkong, November 1, 1877. my1

NOTICE.
THE Business of SHARE and GENERAL BROKERS, hitherto conducted in my name, will now be carried on under the Style of COHEN & HEATON, Mr. ALEXANDER MACGLASHAN HEATON having this Day become a PARTNER therein.

CHAS. C. COHEN.
Hongkong, November 1, 1877. jal

NOTICE.
I HAVE this Day admitted Mr. WILLIAM LEGG as a PARTNER in my Business, which will henceforth be conducted under the Style of HUGHES & LEGG.

W. KERFOOT HUGHES.
Hongkong, November 1, 1877. jal

NOTICE.
MR. JAMES ATTON MANN is authorized to Sign our Firm by Procuration.

GEFF & Co.
Canton, November 1, 1877. jal

NOTICE.
I HAVE this Day Established myself at this Port as MERCHANT and GENERAL COMMISSION AGENT.

W. SCHRIEVER.
Halphong, November 9, 1877. de13

FOR SALE.

FOR SALE.

SECTIONS B & C of Inland Lot No. 51, Area 9880 Square Feet. With the 7 DWELLING HOUSES erected thereon, Nos. 35, 37, 39, 41, 43, 45, and 47, WINDHAM STREET. Annual Crown Rent, \$108.

Island Lot, No. 90. Measuring to the North 80 ft. South 20 " East 20 " West 167 " Area 14,720 Square Feet. With the 4 DWELLING HOUSES erected thereon. 2 Fronting GOVERN STREET. 2 Fronting GOVERN ROAD. Annual Crown Rent, \$174.64. For particulars, apply to J. J. DOS REMEDIOS & Co., Agents.
Hongkong, December 1, 1877. de13

FOR SALE.

SHAMSHAN CANTON.

THE Desirable PROPERTY known as Lot No. 40, consisting of Commodious DWELLING HOUSE, OFFICES and SILE GODOWN. For particulars, apply to G. M. SMITH, Canton.
October 15, 1877.

NOTICES TO CONSIGNEES.

BRITISH STEAMER **BERTHA**, LANCLET, Master, FROM LONDON, PENANG, AND SINGAPORE.

CONSIGNEES of Cargo by the above Steamer are hereby informed, that their Goods are being landed and stored at their risk in the Godowns of the Underwriter, from whence delivery may be obtained.
Consignees wishing to take delivery of their Goods from the Boats alongside the Wharf are at liberty to do so.
Goods remaining in store after the 9th Instant will be subject to rent.
No Fire Insurance has been effected.
Optional Cargo will be forwarded unless written notice to the contrary is given before To-day, the 3rd Instant, at 1 p.m.
Bills of Lading will be countersigned by Wm. PUGST & Co., Agents.
Hongkong, December 3, 1877. de9

FROM LONDON AND PORTS OF CALL.

THE Steamship **Gordon Castle**, having arrived, Consignees of Cargo are hereby informed that their Goods are being landed at their risk by the Underwriter into their Godowns, whence and/or from the Wharf or Boats, delivery may be obtained.
Optional Goods will be forwarded to Shanghai, unless notice to the contrary is given before Noon To-morrow, the 3rd Instant.
Cargo remaining undelivered after the 10th Instant will be subject to rent.
No Fire Insurance has been effected.
Bills of Lading will be countersigned by GIBB, LIVINGSTON & Co., Agents.
Hongkong, December 2, 1877. de10

NOTICE TO CONSIGNEES.

P. & O. S. N. Co.'s S.S. **TEHERAN**.

CONSIGNEES of Cargo by the above-named Vessel, from Bombay and Intermediate Ports, in connection with the Steamship **KASHGAR** from Calcutta, are hereby informed that their Goods are being landed, and stored at their risk in the Company's Godowns, at West Point, whence delivery can be obtained from this date.
Goods not delivered by the 10th Instant will be subject to rent.
ADAM LIND, Superintendent.
Hongkong, December 3, 1877. de10

NOTICES OF FIRMS.

NOTICE.
We have this Day placed the MANAGEMENT of our Business in the hands of Mr. WILLIAM ROSS, who has been in the employment of the Firm for the last Six Years.

G. FALCONER & Co., Watchmakers, Jewellers, &c.
Hongkong, November 30, 1877. de7

NOTICE.
MR. CHARLES DAVID BOTTOMLEY was admitted a PARTNER in our Firm on the 1st July, 1877.

DOUGLAS LAPRAIK & Co.
Hongkong, September 22, 1877.

NOTICE.
I HAVE this Day Established myself at this Port as a GENERAL COMMISSION AGENT.

J. V. VERNON SHAW.
Hongkong, November 1, 1877. my1

NOTICE.
THE Business of SHARE and GENERAL BROKERS, hitherto conducted in my name, will now be carried on under the Style of COHEN & HEATON, Mr. ALEXANDER MACGLASHAN HEATON having this Day become a PARTNER therein.

CHAS. C. COHEN.
Hongkong, November 1, 1877. jal

NOTICE.
I HAVE this Day admitted Mr. WILLIAM LEGG as a PARTNER in my Business, which will henceforth be conducted under the Style of HUGHES & LEGG.

W. KERFOOT HUGHES.
Hongkong, November 1, 1877. jal

NOTICE.
MR. JAMES ATTON MANN is authorized to Sign our Firm by Procuration.

GEFF & Co.
Canton, November 1, 1877. jal

NOTICE.
I HAVE this Day Established myself at this Port as MERCHANT and GENERAL COMMISSION AGENT.

W. SCHRIEVER.
Halphong, November 9, 1877. de13

FOR SALE.

FOR SALE.

SECTIONS B & C of Inland Lot No. 51, Area 9880 Square Feet. With the 7 DWELLING HOUSES erected thereon, Nos. 35, 37, 39, 41, 43, 45, and 47, WINDHAM STREET. Annual Crown Rent, \$108.

Island Lot, No. 90. Measuring to the North 80 ft. South 20 " East 20 " West 167 " Area 14,720 Square Feet. With the 4 DWELLING HOUSES erected thereon. 2 Fronting GOVERN STREET. 2 Fronting GOVERN ROAD. Annual Crown Rent, \$174.64. For particulars, apply to J. J. DOS REMEDIOS & Co., Agents.
Hongkong, December 1, 1877. de13

FOR SALE.

SHAMSHAN CANTON.

THE Desirable PROPERTY known as Lot No. 40, consisting of Commodious DWELLING HOUSE, OFFICES and SILE GODOWN. For particulars, apply to G. M. SMITH, Canton.
October 15, 1877.

NOTICES TO CONSIGNEES.

BRITISH STEAMER **BERTHA**, LANCLET, Master, FROM LONDON, PENANG, AND SINGAPORE.

CONSIGNEES of Cargo by the above Steamer are hereby informed, that their Goods are being landed and stored at their risk in the Godowns of the Underwriter, from whence delivery may be obtained.
Consignees wishing to take delivery of their Goods from the Boats alongside the Wharf are at liberty to do so.
Goods remaining in store after the 9th Instant will be subject to rent.
No Fire Insurance has been effected.
Optional Cargo will be forwarded unless written notice to the contrary is given before To-day, the 3rd Instant, at 1 p.m.
Bills of Lading will be countersigned by Wm. PUGST & Co., Agents.
Hongkong, December 3, 1877. de9

FROM LONDON AND PORTS OF CALL.

THE Steamship **Gordon Castle**, having arrived, Consignees of Cargo are hereby informed that their Goods are being landed at their risk by the Underwriter into their Godowns, whence and/or from the Wharf or Boats, delivery may be obtained.
Optional Goods will be forwarded to Shanghai, unless notice to the contrary is given before Noon To-morrow, the 3rd Instant.
Cargo remaining undelivered after the 10th Instant will be subject to rent.
No Fire Insurance has been effected.
Bills of Lading will be countersigned by GIBB, LIVINGSTON & Co., Agents.
Hongkong, December 2, 1877. de10

NOTICE TO CONSIGNEES.

P. & O. S. N. Co.'s S.S. **TEHERAN**.

CONSIGNEES of Cargo by the above-named Vessel, from Bombay and Intermediate Ports, in connection with the Steamship **KASHGAR** from Calcutta, are hereby informed that their Goods are being landed, and stored at their risk in the Company's Godowns, at West Point, whence delivery can be obtained from this date.
Goods not delivered by the 10th Instant will be subject to rent.
ADAM LIND, Superintendent.
Hongkong, December 3, 1877. de10

NOTICES OF FIRMS.

NOTICE.
We have this Day placed the MANAGEMENT of our Business in the hands of Mr. WILLIAM ROSS, who has been in the employment of the Firm for the last Six Years.

G. FALCONER & Co., Watchmakers, Jewellers, &c.
Hongkong, November 30, 1877. de7

NOTICE.
MR. CHARLES DAVID BOTTOMLEY was admitted a PARTNER in our Firm on the 1st July, 1877.

DOUGLAS LAPRAIK & Co.
Hongkong, September 22, 1877.

NOTICE.
I HAVE this Day Established myself at this Port as a GENERAL COMMISSION AGENT.

J. V. VERNON SHAW.
Hongkong, November 1, 1877. my1

NOTICE.
THE Business of SHARE and GENERAL BROKERS, hitherto conducted in my name, will now be carried on under the Style of COHEN & HEATON, Mr. ALEXANDER MACGLASHAN HEATON having this Day become a PARTNER therein.

CHAS. C. COHEN.
Hongkong, November 1, 1877. jal

NOTICE.
I HAVE this Day admitted Mr. WILLIAM LEGG as a PARTNER in my Business, which will henceforth be conducted under the Style of HUGHES & LEGG.

W. KERFOOT HUGHES.
Hongkong, November 1, 1877. jal

NOTICE.
MR. JAMES ATTON MANN is authorized to Sign our Firm by Procuration.

GEFF & Co.
Canton, November 1, 1877. jal

NOTICE.
I HAVE this Day Established myself at this Port as MERCHANT and GENERAL COMMISSION AGENT.

W. SCHRIEVER.
Halphong, November 9, 1877. de13

FOR SALE.

FOR SALE.

SECTIONS B & C of Inland Lot No. 51, Area 9880 Square Feet. With the 7 DWELLING HOUSES erected thereon, Nos. 35, 37, 39, 41, 43, 45, and 47, WINDHAM STREET. Annual Crown Rent, \$108.

Island Lot, No. 90. Measuring to the North 80 ft. South 20 " East 20 " West 167 " Area 14,720 Square Feet. With the 4 DWELLING HOUSES erected thereon. 2 Fronting GOVERN STREET. 2 Fronting GOVERN ROAD. Annual Crown Rent, \$174.64. For particulars, apply to J. J. DOS REMEDIOS & Co., Agents.
Hongkong, December 1, 1877. de13

FOR SALE.

SHAMSHAN CANTON.

THE Desirable PROPERTY known as Lot No. 40, consisting of Commodious DWELLING HOUSE, OFFICES and SILE GODOWN. For particulars, apply to G. M. SMITH, Canton.
October 15, 1877.

NOTICES TO CONSIGNEES.

BRITISH STEAMER **BERTHA**, LANCLET, Master, FROM LONDON, PENANG, AND SINGAPORE.

CONSIGNEES of Cargo by the above Steamer are hereby informed, that their Goods are being landed and stored at their risk in the Godowns of the Underwriter, from whence delivery may be obtained.
Consignees wishing to take delivery of their Goods from the Boats alongside the Wharf are at liberty to do so.
Goods remaining in store after the 9th Instant will be subject to rent.
No Fire Insurance has been effected.
Optional Cargo will be forwarded unless written notice to the contrary is given before To-day, the 3rd Instant, at 1 p.m.
Bills of Lading will be countersigned by Wm. PUGST & Co., Agents.
Hongkong, December 3, 1877. de9

FROM LONDON AND PORTS OF CALL.

THE Steamship **Gordon Castle**, having arrived, Consignees of Cargo are hereby informed that their Goods are being landed at their risk by the Underwriter into their Godowns, whence and/or from the Wharf or Boats, delivery may be obtained.
Optional Goods will be forwarded to Shanghai, unless notice to the contrary is given before Noon To-morrow, the 3rd Instant.
Cargo remaining undelivered after the 10th Instant will be subject to rent.
No Fire Insurance has been effected.
Bills of Lading will be countersigned by GIBB, LIVINGSTON & Co., Agents.
Hongkong, December 2, 1877. de10

NOTICE TO CONSIGNEES.

P. & O. S. N. Co.'s S.S. **TEHERAN**.

CONSIGNEES of Cargo by the above-named Vessel, from Bombay and Intermediate Ports, in connection with the Steamship **KASHGAR** from Calcutta, are hereby informed that their Goods are being landed, and stored at their risk in the Company's Godowns, at West Point, whence delivery can be obtained from this date.
Goods not delivered by the 10th Instant will be subject to rent.
ADAM LIND, Superintendent.
Hongkong, December 3, 1877. de10

NOTICES OF FIRMS.

NOTICE.
We have this Day placed the MANAGEMENT of our Business in the hands of Mr. WILLIAM ROSS, who has been in the employment of the Firm for the last Six Years.

G. FALCONER & Co., Watchmakers, Jewellers, &c.
Hongkong, November 30, 1877. de7

NOTICE.
MR. CHARLES DAVID BOTTOMLEY was admitted a PARTNER in our Firm on the 1st July, 1877.

DOUGLAS LAPRAIK & Co.
Hongkong, September 22, 1877.

NOTICE.
I HAVE this Day Established myself at this Port as a GENERAL COMMISSION AGENT.

J. V. VERNON SHAW.
Hongkong, November 1, 1877. my1

NOTICE.
THE Business of SHARE and GENERAL BROKERS, hitherto conducted in my name, will now be carried on under the Style of COHEN & HEATON, Mr. ALEXANDER MACGLASHAN HEATON having this Day become a PARTNER therein.

CHAS. C. COHEN.
Hongkong, November 1, 1877. jal

NOTICE.
I HAVE this Day admitted Mr. WILLIAM LEGG as a PARTNER in my Business, which will henceforth be conducted under the Style of HUGHES & LEGG.

W. KERFOOT HUGHES.
Hongkong, November 1, 1877. jal

NOTICE.
MR. JAMES ATTON MANN is authorized to Sign our Firm by Procuration.

GEFF & Co.
Canton, November 1, 1877. jal

NOTICE.
I HAVE this Day Established myself at this Port as MERCHANT and GENERAL COMMISSION AGENT.

W. SCHRIEVER.
Halphong, November 9, 1877. de13

FOR SALE.

FOR SALE.

SECTIONS B & C of Inland Lot No. 51, Area 9880 Square Feet. With the 7 DWELLING HOUSES erected thereon, Nos. 35, 37, 39, 41, 43, 45, and 47, WINDHAM STREET. Annual Crown Rent, \$108.

Island Lot, No. 90. Measuring to the North 80 ft. South 20 " East 20 " West 167 " Area 14,720 Square Feet. With the 4 DWELLING HOUSES erected thereon. 2 Fronting GOVERN STREET. 2 Fronting GOVERN ROAD. Annual Crown Rent, \$174.64. For particulars, apply to J. J. DOS REMEDIOS & Co., Agents.
Hongkong, December 1, 1877. de13

FOR SALE.

SHAMSHAN CANTON.

THE Desirable PROPERTY known as Lot No. 40, consisting of Commodious DWELLING HOUSE, OFFICES and SILE GODOWN. For particulars, apply to G. M. SMITH, Canton.
October 15, 1877.

NOTICES TO CONSIGNEES.

BRITISH STEAMER **BERTHA**, LANCLET, Master, FROM LONDON, PENANG, AND SINGAPORE.

CONSIGNEES of Cargo by the above Steamer are hereby informed, that their Goods are being landed and stored at their risk in the Godowns of the Underwriter, from whence delivery may be obtained.
Consignees wishing to take delivery of their Goods from the Boats alongside the Wharf are at liberty to do so.
Goods remaining in store after the 9th Instant will be subject to rent.
No Fire Insurance has been effected.
Optional Cargo will be forwarded unless written notice to the contrary is given before To-day, the 3rd Instant, at 1 p.m.
Bills of Lading will be countersigned by Wm. PUGST & Co., Agents.
Hongkong, December 3, 1877. de9

FROM LONDON AND PORTS OF CALL.

THE Steamship **Gordon Castle**, having arrived, Consignees of Cargo are hereby informed that their Goods are being landed at their risk by the Underwriter into their Godowns, whence and/or from the Wharf or Boats, delivery may be obtained.
Optional Goods will be forwarded to Shanghai, unless notice to the contrary is given before Noon To-morrow, the 3rd Instant.
Cargo remaining undelivered after the 10th Instant will be subject to rent.
No Fire Insurance has been effected.
Bills of Lading will be countersigned by GIBB, LIVINGSTON & Co., Agents.
Hongkong, December 2, 1877. de10

NOTICE TO CONSIGNEES.

P. & O. S. N. Co.'s S.S. **TEHERAN**.

CONSIGNEES of Cargo by the above-named Vessel, from Bombay and Intermediate Ports, in connection with the Steamship **KASHGAR** from Calcutta, are hereby informed that their Goods are being landed, and stored at their risk in the Company's Godowns, at West Point, whence delivery can be obtained from this date.
Goods not delivered by the 10th Instant will be subject to rent.
ADAM LIND, Superintendent.
Hongkong, December 3, 1877. de10

NOTICES OF FIRMS.

NOTICE.
We have this Day placed the MANAGEMENT of our Business in the hands of Mr. WILLIAM ROSS, who has been in the employment of the Firm for the last Six Years.

G. FALCONER & Co., Watchmakers, Jewellers, &c.
Hongkong, November 30, 1877. de7

NOTICE.
MR. CHARLES DAVID BOTTOMLEY was admitted a PARTNER in our Firm on the 1st July, 1877.

DOUGLAS LAPRAIK & Co.
Hongkong, September 22, 1877.

NOTICE.
I HAVE this Day Established myself at this Port as a GENERAL COMMISSION AGENT.

J. V. VERNON SHAW.
Hongkong, November 1, 1877. my1

NOTICE.
THE Business of SHARE and GENERAL BROKERS, hitherto conducted in my name, will now be carried on under the Style of COHEN & HEATON, Mr. ALEXANDER MACGLASHAN HEATON having this Day become a PARTNER therein.

CHAS. C. COHEN.
Hongkong, November 1, 1877. jal

NOTICE.
I HAVE this Day admitted Mr. WILLIAM LEGG as a PARTNER in my Business, which will henceforth be conducted under the Style of HUGHES & LEGG.

W. KERFOOT HUGHES.
Hongkong, November 1, 1877. jal